



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,994	05/24/2006	Won Sik Nam	2017-089	1500
53706 IPLA P.A. 3550 WILSHIRE BLVD. 17TH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90010	7590 03/29/2010		EXAMINER NUCKOLES, TIFFANY Z	
			ART UNIT 1792	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/29/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/595,994

**Applicant(s)**

NAM, WON SIK

**Examiner**

TIFFANY NUCKOLS

**Art Unit**

1792

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 January 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3 and 6-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3 and 6-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 May 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-06)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. **Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 11, and 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6143079 to Halpin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6391804 to Grant et al, U.S. Patent Application No. 2005/0268567 to Devine et al and U.S. Patent No. 6373159 to Shinozaki.**

4. In regards to Claim 1, Halpin teaches a semiconductor processing reactor (See *Halpin, 8 Figures 1 and 2*), i.e., rapid thermal processing system, comprising: a chamber (See *Halpin, 10 Figures 2*) with an inlet port provided at a lateral wall of the chamber (See *Halpin, the channel of 116 Figures 1 and 2*), i.e., a processing gas injection port, and at the opposite lateral wall thereof an exhaust manifold (See *Halpin, 124 Figure 2*), i.e., a processing gas exhaust ports. Halpin teaches a heating element

(See Halpin, 89 Figures 1 and 2), i.e., heat source installed in the chamber for heating a wafer (See Halpin, Column 5 lines 49-51 and 56 Figure 2); a transparent upper wall made of quartz (See Halpin, 12 Figures 1 and 2, Column 5 lines 49-51), i.e., quartz window mounted on the chamber such that the quartz window is located below the heat source and has an area larger than that of the inner surface of the chamber as it defines the inner space by enclosing the top portion of it (See Halpin, 12 relative to 16 Fig. 2, Col. 5 lines 21-28) ; a spider, (See Halpin, 40 Figure 2) i.e., edge ring-support installed in the chamber such that edge ring-support can be located below the quartz window; and a wafer holder (See Halpin, 36 Figure 2), i.e., an edge ring equipped on the edge ring-support for mounting the wafer. Halpin teaches the chamber has an inner surface with a top-down cross-section in a multi-line shape consisting of a plurality of arcs separated from each other and having the same radius and the same center and a plurality of straight lines connecting the arcs to each other (See Halpin, Column 4, lines 65-67 and Figure 3). Halpin further teaches the chamber has a side cross-section of the inner surface in a multi-line shape consisting of a plurality of arcs separated from each other and having the same relative radius and the same relative center and a plurality of straight lines connecting the arcs to each other (See Halpin, Figure 2 and Figure 3). Although Halpin it can be argued that does not explicitly teach that the apparatus is for rapid thermal processing, the apparatus as taught by Halpin is structurally capable of performing the intended use and therefore anticipates rapid thermal processing. It has been held that claims directed to apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. *In re Danly*, 263 F.2d 844, 847, 120 USPQ 528,

531 (CCPA 1959). Also, a claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987). MPEP 2114 and MPEP 2115.

5. Halpin does not expressly teach the quartz window has a square shape. However, a change of shape is generally recognized as being within the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art. It is noted that Applicant has not made any showing of criticality shape of the inner top surface that would tend to point toward the non-obviousness of a square shaped window as a matter of choice. *In re Dailey*, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966). See MPEP 2144.04 IV B. The resulting apparatus would have a quartz window with a square shape having edges, which at least in part, are aligned with a straight line portion of the inner surface of the chamber, such that the sides of the square window are opposed to the lines of the inner surface of the chamber, *as broadly recited in the claim*. Furthermore, because the quartz window is larger than that of the inner surface of the chamber, it would be implicitly positioned outside of the straight line portion as a matter of relative sizing.

6. Halpin does not explicitly disclose that the arcs have a central angle of 15-50°.

7. Grant et al teaches the chamber has six straight line sides and six curves connected by the straight lines (See *Grant et al*, Figure 2). The chamber there has six lines and six arcs distributed around 360°, such that the twelve lines/arcs could be divided equally around the chamber and the arcs would have an implicit relative central

angle of 30°. Furthermore, Grant et al teaches that the wafer exhibits spatial temperature nonuniformities that are dependent on the walls of the enclosed process chamber (See *Grant et al*, Column 1 lines 63-67 and Column 2 lines 1-2) and that the generally hexagonal enclosed process chamber is shaped in order to reduce temperature measurement errors induced by lamp radiation by the concentrically located edge ring (See *Grant et al*, Column 2 lines 62-67 and Column 3 lines 1-5), such that the shape of the chamber is a result-effective variable in uniformly processing the wafer.

8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to alternatively modify the teachings of Halpin to change the size of the relative central angle of the arcs as taught by Grant et al, through routine experimentation, for the predictable result reduce temperature measurement errors induced by lamp radiation and prevent wafer spatial temperature nonuniformities. It is noted that Applicant has not made any showing of criticality in the size of the central angle that would tend to point toward the non-obviousness of freely selecting any arc central angle as a matter of choice to obtain desired temperature uniformity. See MPEP 2144 - IV.

9. Alternatively, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art at the time of the invention, to substitute the chamber shape of Halpin with that of Grant et al. One would be motivated to do so to uniformly process a wafer by changing the shape of the chamber as a result-effective variable in improving process uniformity.

10. Halpin in view of Grant et al do not teach the outer peripheral surface of the quartz window consists of a combination of a tilt surface, a perpendicular surface, and a round surface.

11. Devine et al teach of a chamber arrangement for rapid thermal processing (See *Devine et al, Paragraph 0002*). The chamber arrangement (See *Devine et al, 102 Figure 2*) has a quartz window (See *Devine et al, 120 Figure 2*) mounted on a window aperture, i.e., mounting portion of the chamber (See *Devine et al, 108 Figure 2 and Paragraph 0025*). Devine et al further teach of an embodiment of this chamber arrangement where an O-ring (See *Devine et al, 154 Figure 3*) is in contact with the outer diameter, i.e., outer peripheral surface, of the quartz window and a portion of the mounting portion of the chamber (See *Devine et al, Paragraph 0042*). Devine et al teach that this embodiment uses the o-ring to achieve a vacuum seal of the chamber (See *Devine et al, Paragraph 0041-0042*) which is desirable to obtain the desired leak rate of the chamber (See *Devine et al, Paragraph 0006*), i.e., prevent leakage of the chamber. Devine et al teach of a support surface (See *Devine et al, 159a Figure 3*) which is oblique, i.e., tilted and a sealing surface (See *Devine et al, 159b Figure 3*) which is perpendicular, on the outer peripheral surface of the quartz window (See *Devine et al, 120 Figure 3*). The tilted and the perpendicular surfaces are connected by a rounded corner, i.e., surface (See *Devine et al, Rounded Corners of 120 Figure 3*). The surface configurations evenly distribute the biasing forces and pressure differential produced forces in the chamber (See *Devine et al, Paragraph 0041*) which prevents the development of localized high stress points (See *Devine et al, Paragraph 0038*) which

can lead to fractures in the window (*See Devine et al, Paragraph 0007*). It is noted that Devine et al also teaches that the window can be inverted as desired without limitation (*See Devine et al, Paragraph 0031*).

12. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the rapid thermal processing chamber as taught by Halpin, by improving the window with a multi-surfaced quartz window, as taught by Devine et al. One would be motivated to do so, with a reasonable expectation of success, in order to evenly distribute the biasing forces and pressure differential produced forces in the chamber in order to prevent localized high stress points which lead to fractures in the window.

13. Halpin in view of Grant et al and Devine et al teach a region below the quartz window and the inner surface, i.e., straight line portion of the chamber (the region in 16 below 12 overlapping sidewall liner 18 Fig. 2) or where the edge of the quartz window and the chamber inner surface meet, which also corresponds to the portion of the chamber surrounding the substrate support, i.e., edge ring.

14. Halpin in view of Grant et al in view of Devine et al do not expressly teach a cooling water jacket being installed in the chamber such that the cooling water jacket is positioned at that region.

15. Shinozaki teaches a rapid thermal processing apparatus (Fig. 1) with a cooling water jacket 15 positioned in a sidewall 14 of the apparatus and surrounding the substrate support, such that the cooling water jacket is positioned at least in part within the chamber of the apparatus and directly below the meeting of the quartz window 9



and a part of the sidewall or inner chamber surface 3 (*See Shinozaki, Col. 4 line 6-Col. 5 line 44, Claims 1-11, arrang. of 15 below 9 Fig. 2*). Shinozaki further teaches that the cooling water jackets are there to remove heat from the processing chamber (*See Shinozaki, Col. 5 lines 39-44*).

16. Because it is known in the art to include either a cooling water jacket to surround a substrate support, namely, an effective way to remove heat from the processing chamber, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a cooling water jacket below the edge of the quartz window and surrounding the substrate support. See MPEP 2143 Rationale A. The resulting apparatus would yield the claimed invention, as the addition of the cooling water jacket would be in the chamber in a region defined by the edge of the quartz window and the straight line portion of the inner surface of the chamber.

17. In regards to Claim 3, Halpin teaches a quartz side wall (*See Halpin, 18 Figure 2, Column 6 lines 40-45*) which is intimately connected to the quartz window, forming an outer peripheral surface of the quartz window. Halpin teaches an O-ring (*See Halpin, 126 Figure 2*) is interposed between the outer peripheral surface of the quartz window and a flange (*See Halpin, 20 Figure 2*), i.e., mounting portion of the chamber at which the quartz window is mounted (*See Halpin, 126 Figure 2*).

18. In regards to Claim 6, Halpin teaches the chamber has a gas injector (*See Halpin, 112 Figure 2*), i.e., injection pipe, is connected to a reactant gas flow needle valve (*See Halpin, 114 Figure 2*), i.e., processing gas injection nozzle. The channel below the injection nozzle, i.e., processing gas injection port is aligned in the injection

pipe. Halpin et al teaches the processing gas exhaust port (*See Halpin, 124 Figure 2*) is formed with at least two exhaust ports (*See Halpin, 24, 26, 28 122 Figure 2*) aligned in the processing gas exhaust port and having a height, i.e., diameter larger than that of the processing gas injection port (*See Halpin, Figure 2 and Column 12 lines 26-37*).

19. In regards to Claim 8, Halpin teaches that an inlet (*See Halpin, 22 Figure 2*), i.e., wafer feeding passage has the processing injection nozzle connected to the processing injection ports formed on a wall of the wafer feeding passage (*See Halpin, Column 11 lines 16-23*). Halpin further teaches that the injection ports can be arranged in a separate outside flange that interfaces with the gate valve, i.e., formed on a lateral wall of the wafer feeding passage (*See Halpin, Column 11 lines 23-27*).

20. In regards to Claim 11, Halpin et al teach of a purge gas supply (*See Halpin, 44 Figure 2*), i.e., cooling gas injection part for injecting a cooling gas into the chamber and a lower longitudinal aperture (*See Halpin, 102 Figure 2*), i.e., a cooling gas exhaust part, which is located near the outlet port (*See Halpin, 24 Figure 2*), to be evacuated outside of the chamber (*See Halpin, Column 12 lines 12-25*). The first cooling gas injection part and the first cooling gas exhaust part being installed on lower portion (*See Halpin, 32 Figure 2*), i.e., the bottom surface, of the chamber. Although Halpin does not teach that the purge gas is a cooling gas, the particular type of gas used is a process limitation rather than an apparatus limitation, and the recitation of a particular type of gas does not limit an apparatus claim, see *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235; *In re Rishoi*, 94 USPQ 71; *In re Young*, 25 USPQ 69; *In re Dulberg*, 129 USPQ 348; *Ex parte Thibault*, 64 USPQ 666; and *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647. MPEP 2114 and MPEP 2115.

21. In regards to Claim 13, Halpin et al teach that the gas injector (*See Halpin, 112 Figure 2*) on the lateral wall of the chamber includes a plurality of reactant gas flow needle valves (*See Halpin, 114 Figure 2*) for supplying gases through a plurality of spaced apart ports (*Halpin, Column 11, Lines 9-27*). At least some of the gas ports may be considered as making up a second cooling gas part, wherein said gas ports are spaced apart from other ports which may be considered as the processing gas inject ports. Although Halpin does not expressly teach that the process gas is a cooling gas, the particular type of gas used is a process limitation rather than an apparatus limitation, and the recitation of a particular type of gas does not limit an apparatus claim, see *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235; *In re Rishoi*, 94 USPQ 71; *In re Young*, 25 USPQ 69; *In re Dulberg*, 129 USPQ 348; *Ex parte Thibault*, 64 USPQ 666; and *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647. MPEP 2114 and MPEP 2115. Moreover, the process gas function as a cooling gas, due to the ability to transfer of heat from the substrate surfaces as the gas flows over them. Additionally, the gas injection port may be considered to have an injection end with a gentle slope formed at a predetermined region of the injection end (*See Halpin, the horizontally formed aperture at the end of vertical needle valve indicated by 94 Figure 2*) such that at least a portion of the gas being injected can flow along the lateral wall of the chamber based at least upon the diffusion of the gas as it exits the port, and may be considered to have a steep slope formed at a rest region of the injection end (*See Halpin, the vertically formed channel of the exhaust path, indicated by 94 Figure 2 and Column 11, Lines 9-36*). The injection ends are next to the

lateral walls of the chamber (*See Halpin, arrangement of 94 Figure 2 to sidewall of chamber*) such that they are implicitly against the lateral walls of the chamber.

22. Furthermore, it has been held that claims directed to apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. *In re Danly*, 263 F.2d 844, 847, 120 USPQ 528, 531 (CCPA 1959). Also, a claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987). MPEP 2114 and MPEP 2115.

23. **Claims 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6143079 to Halpin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6391804 to Grant et al, U.S. Patent Application No. 2005/0268567 to Devine et al and U.S. Patent No. 6373159 to Shinozaki, as applied to Claim 1 above, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6501191 to Tanaka et al.**

24. The teachings of Halpin in view of Grant et al, Devine et al, and Shinozaki are relied upon as set forth above.

25. In regards to Claim 7, Halpin in view of Grant et al, Devine et al, and Shinozaki do not teach each of the processing gas exhaust ports is provided with an oxygen concentration detector.

26. Tanaka et al teach a heat treatment apparatus (*See Tanaka et al, 20 Figures 9 and 10*) with oxygen sensors (*See Tanaka et al, 89a-c Figures 9 and 10*) that detect oxygen concentration upstream of the exhaust mechanism, i.e., processing gas exhaust

ports. The oxygen sensors, i.e., oxygen concentration detectors are used to detect oxygen concentrations as oxygen levels above predetermined limits increase the dielectric constant of the formed interlayer insulating film, rendering the films nonuniform in the film quality of the wafer (*See Tanaka et al, Column 1 lines 44-49*). Tanaka teaches that increased oxygen concentrations during processing increases the dielectric constant of the formed interlayer insulating film, which renders the films nonuniform in the film quality of every wafer (*See Tanaka et al, Column 1 lines 31-49*).

27. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the rapid thermal processing system of Halpin in view of Grant et al, Devine et al, and Shinozaki by adding oxygen concentration detectors with each of the processing exhaust ports, as taught by Tanaka et al. One would be motivated to do so, with a reasonable expectation of success, to monitor oxygen levels to keep them at or below a predetermined limit to ensure the film quality of every wafer.

**28. Claims 9, 10, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6143079 to Halpin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6391804 to Grant et al, U.S. Patent Application No. 2005/0268567 to Devine et al and U.S. Patent No. 6373159 to Shinozaki, as applied to Claims 1 and 13 respectively above, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6133152 to Bierman et al.**

29. The teachings of Halpin are relied upon as set forth above.

30. In regards to Claim 9, Halpin in view of Grant et al, Devine et al, and Shinozaki do not teach the edge ring-support comprises: a rotational member installed in the

chamber and having a rotational wing with a groove formed on an upper surface of the rotational wing; a cylinder connected to the rotational wing and mounting the edge ring on an upper surface of the cylinder; a cylinder guide engaged with the cylinder; and a cylinder guide-fixing pin for fixing the cylinder guide to the rotational wing.

31. Bierman et al teach an rapid thermal processing chamber (*See Bierman et al, 100 Figure 2*) with a rotor system (*See Bierman et al, 111 Figure 2*), i.e., rotational member with an edge ring (*See Bierman et al, 119 Figure 5*) that is supported by a support cylinder (*See Bierman et al, 115 Figure 5*), such that the edge ring is mounted on an upper surface of the cylinder (*See Bierman et al, Figure 5*). The cylinder is connected to a rotor (*See Bierman et al, 113 Figure 5*), i.e., rotational wing, which has a groove on an upper surface for receiving locator pins (*See Bierman et al, 123 Figure 5*), i.e., cylinder guide. The cylinder guide touches the cylinder, i.e., is engaged with the cylinder and has a pin plug (*See Bierman et al, 159 Figure 5*), i.e., cylinder guide-fixing pin, that friction-fit secures, or fixes, the cylinder guide to the rotational wing (*See Bierman et al, Column 8 lines 39-44*). The rotational member taught by Bierman reduces the occurrence of multiple gas vortices in a semiconductor processing chamber, which in turn reduces film non-uniformity (*See Bierman et al, Column 2 lines 23-31 and Column 4 lines 32-50*), i.e., improves film quality.

32. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the rapid thermal processing system's edge ring-support as taught by Halpin in view of Grant et al, Devine et al, and Shinozaki, with the rotational member for substrate support of Bierman et al. One would be motivated to do so, with a

reasonable expectation for success, to reduce the occurrence of multiple gas vortices in a semiconductor processing chamber, which in turn reduces film non-uniformity, i.e., improves film quality.

33. In regards to Claim 10, Halpin in view of Grant et al, Devine et al, and Shinozaki do not teach a rapid thermal processing system further comprising a cooling/heating water-circulation passage provided in an inner wall of the chamber such that the circulation passage surrounds an outer peripheral surface of the edge ring and a predetermined area of the edge ring-support.

34. Bierman et al teach of a water-cooled stainless steel bearing cover (*See Bierman et al, 161 Figure 5*), i.e., a cooling/heating water circulation passage provided in an inner wall of the chamber such that the circulation passage surrounds an outer peripheral surface of the edge ring and a predetermined area of the edge ring support (*See Bierman et al, Column 9 lines 22-25*). The water circulation passage protects components below it from corrosion by the deposition process (*See Bierman et al, Column 9 lines 22-29*). Bierman et al further teaches a circulation circuit with chambers (*See Bierman et al, 146 Figure 5*) fed by coolant inlets (*See Bierman et al, 185 Figure 5*) for circulating cooled gas or liquid (*See Bierman et al, column 6 lines 62-65*) that behaves as a cooling reflector to enable precise temperature measurements (*See Bierman et al, Column 2 lines 11-19*) and can alternatively be a cooling/heating water circulation passage provided in an inner wall of the chamber such that the circulation passage surrounds an outer peripheral surface of the edge ring and a predetermined area of the edge ring support.

35. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the rapid thermal processing system as taught by Halpin in view of Grant et al, Devine et al, and Shinozaki, with the cooling/heating water circulation passages as taught by Bierman. One would be motivated to do so, with a reasonable expectation of success, to protect the components below it from corrosion and to provide a cooling reflector for precise temperature measurements.

36. In regards to Claim 14, Halpin in view of Grant et al, Devine et al, and Shinozaki do not teach the cooling/heating water-circulation passage has a groove formed around an outer surface of the cooling/heating water-circulation passage facing the inner wall of the chamber, and the rapid thermal processing system may further comprise a third cooling gas injection part and a third cooling gas exhaust part installed in the chamber being connected to the groove, respectively.

37. Bierman teaches the cooling/heating water-circulation passage has a side channel for circulating purge gas (*See Bierman et al, 175 Figure 5*), i.e., groove formed around an outer surface of the cooling/heating water-circulation passage facing the inner wall of the chamber (*See Bierman et al, Column 11 lines 17-33*). Bierman teaches the rapid thermal processing system may further comprise another purge gas source, i.e., third cooling gas injection part and a third cooling gas exhaust part installed in the chamber being connected to the groove, respectively. The third cooling gas ensures that a continuous back pressure is maintained so that deposition does not occur on the backside of the substrate (*See Bierman et al, Column 11 lines 34-39*).



38. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the rapid thermal processing apparatus of Halpin in view of Grant et al, Devine et al, and Shinozaki, with the third cooling gas as taught by Bierman et al. One would be motivated to do so, with a reasonable expectation of success, to ensure that a continuous back pressure is maintained so that deposition does not occur on the backside of the substrate.

**39. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6143079 to Halpin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6391804 to Grant et al, U.S. Patent Application No. 2005/0268567 to Devine et al and U.S. Patent No. 6373159 to Shinozaki, as applied to Claim 1 above, and in further view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2006/0057799 to Horiguchi et al.**

40. The teachings of Halpin in view of Grant et al and Devine et al are relied upon as set forth above.

41. In regards to Claim 12, Halpin in view of Grant et al, Devine et al, and Shinozaki do not teach the first cooling gas injection part comprises a plurality of injection holes radially arranged therein, and a cap installed at an upper portion of the injection holes to define a predetermined space opened between the injection holes and the cap.

42. Horiguchi et al teach of a substrate processing apparatus, i.e., rapid thermal processing system, with a processing vessel, i.e., chamber with an inner surface of arcs connected by straight lines (*See Horiguchi et al, 22 Figure 9*), a rotational drive unit edge ring-support (*See Horiguchi et al, 28 Figure 9*) with a susceptor (*See Horiguchi et al, 118 Figure 9*), i.e., edge ring, and a gas supply unit (*See Horiguchi et al, 34 Figure*

9). Horiguchi et al further teaches that the gas supply openings has a gas injection nozzle unit (See *Horiguchi et al*, 93 Figure 19) which is connected to a supply line (See *Horiguchi et al*, 99 Figure 19) with radially arranged injection holes (See *Horiguchi et al*, 93<sub>a1</sub>-93<sub>an</sub> Figure 19 and Figure 20), and nozzle plates(See *Horiguchi et al*, 93<sub>b1</sub>-93<sub>bn</sub> Figure 19), i.e., caps, installed at an upper portion of the injection holes to define a predetermined space (See *Horiguchi et al*, 93<sub>c1</sub>-93<sub>c3</sub> Figure 19) opened between the injection holes and the cap. Horiguchi et al teach that the gas nozzle apparatus directs the gas injection through the entire width of the processing space at a constant flow rate to produce an evenly formed film on the substrate, i.e., wafer (See *Horiguchi et al*, Paragraph 0185 and 0191).

43. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the gas injection ports of Halpin in view of Grant et al, Devine et al, and Shinozaki by adding a nozzle as taught by Horiguchi et al. One would be motivated to do so, with a reasonable expectation of success, to direct the gas through the entire width of the processing space at a constant flow rate to produce an evenly formed film on the wafer.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

44. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, and 6-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, which are necessitated by the amendments to the claims.

45. Specifically, the cooling water jacket limitation has been remedied by the teachings of Shinozaki.

**Conclusion**

46. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TIFFANY NUCKOLS whose telephone number is (571)270-7377. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9:00AM - 5:30 PM.

47. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on 571-272-1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

48. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/TIFFANY NUCKOLS/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1792

/Parviz Hassanzadeh/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1792